

## APPENDIX E

### RELATIONSHIP to PLANS, POLICIES and REGULATIONS

---

## APPENDIX E: RELATIONSHIP TO PLANS, POLICIES AND REGULATIONS

This appendix identifies existing plans, policies and regulations deemed most relevant to the Proposed Master Plan. Local plans and policies analyzed in this section include the following:

- King County's Comprehensive Plan;
- King County's Zoning Code – Title 21A
  - 21A.04 Zones, Maps and Designations - Urban Residential Zone
  - 21A.08 Permitted Uses
  - 21A.12 Development Standards – Density and Dimensions
  - 21A.24 Environmentally Sensitive Areas
- King County's Demonstration Ordinance (No. 14662)
- Seattle's Westwood & Highland Park Neighborhood Plan;
- Seattle's Regulations for Environmentally Critical Areas (SMC Chapter 25.09); and
- White Center's Community Development Investment Plan.

This appendix focuses on the consistency of the Proposed Master Plan with relevant plans, policies and regulations (per WAC 197-11-440 (6)(d)(i)). The Design Alternative Master Plan, by definition, is designed to be consistent with existing regulations. No Action reflects a continuation of existing conditions; because of the age of the existing development, it may not meet many of King County's policies and regulatory requirements.

Relevant federal policies and regulations are also discussed, including  
Endangered Species Act  
Historic Preservation Act, Section 106  
HUD Noise Regulations

### Local Plans, Policies & Regulations

#### King County

##### ***King County Comprehensive Plan (2000)***

***Summary:*** The Growth Management Act (GMA), adopted by the state legislature in 1990, requires urban counties to develop comprehensive land use plans addressing thirteen planning goals relevant to managing growth. The GMA also requires counties and cities to work together to develop framework policies to guide the comprehensive plan development. These Countywide Planning Policies (CPP), first adopted in 1992, establish a vision for the future of King County, its cities, unincorporated urban areas, rural areas, and farms and forests. Under the CPP vision for the year 2012, King County will reflect a diversified sound regional economy and high quality of life with a defined rural area, busy urban centers linked by a high capacity transit system and preservation of many natural areas.

King County's *Comprehensive Plan* was adopted in December 1994 to meet the requirements of the State Growth Management Act; the Comprehensive Plan was updated in February 2001 (King County 1995, 96, 97, 98, 99, 00, 01). This plan supports the Multiple Urban Center concepts of the Multi-County Planning Policies (PSRC, 1993), as well as King County's

Countywide Planning Policies (King County, 1992). King County's Comprehensive Plan builds on the vision established in the CPPs for the unincorporated areas of the county. The policies in this plan support the following objectives, which reflect the GMA goals, the CPP and public opinion:

- Preserve the high quality of life...;
- Spend money wisely and deliver services efficiently...;
- Continue our economic prosperity...;
- Increase the housing choices for all residents...;
- Ensure that necessary transportation facilities and services are available to serve development at the time of occupancy and use...;
- Balance urban uses and environmental protection...; and
- Preserve rural, resource and ecologically fragile areas for future generations...

The County's Comprehensive Plan consists of nine major elements – *Regional Planning, Urban Communities, Rural Legacy and Natural Resource Lands, Environment, Parks, Open Space and Cultural Resources, Transportation, Service, Facilities, and Utilities, Community Planning Areas, and Implementation*. Each element contains goals and policies that are intended to guide the development of the County in the context of regional growth management for the next 20 years. The *Urban Communities* and *Environment* elements are the most relevant to this proposal.

The *Urban Communities Element* includes the following major components:

- Urban Land Use;
- Potential Annexation Areas;
- Economic Development;
- Housing;
- Human Services; and
- Community Action Strategies.

Relevant goals and policies from each section are discussed below.

## **URBAN LAND USE**

- A. *Urban Communities*** – *The challenge for King County and its residents is to create urban communities that provide the places and ways people want to live, as well as respond to the cultural and economic diversity of neighborhoods. Urban communities need not only physical infrastructure, they also need a broad range of amenities and human services that make them attractive and safe places to work and live, while protecting the physical environment and maintaining quality of life.*

Policy U-101 – Development within the Urban Growth Area should create and maintain safe, healthy and diverse communities. These communities should contain a range of affordable housing and employment opportunities, school and recreational facilities and should be designed to protect the natural environment and significant cultural resources.

**Discussion:** The Proposed Master Plan contains a range of affordable housing types; would improve and increase affordable housing options within White Center urban area; would provide employment opportunities through

proposed non-residential establishments; would contain recreational facilities such as parks and trails; and would be proximate to a public school. It is located within an urban area, proximate to public transit routes. Capital facilities would be reconstructed to King County standards and would be adequate. Critical areas would be avoided and/or protected.

2. **Growth in Cities and Urban Centers** – *The King County Comprehensive Plan directly affects land use planning decisions only in unincorporated King County. The cities, however, contain most of the County's economic base and its urban population and provide urban services to adjacent unincorporated areas....The significant role of the cities and districts therefore must be recognized in County decision-making and through future planning efforts.*

**Policy U-109** – Development standards for urban areas should emphasize ways to allow maximum permitted densities and uses of urban land while not compromising the function of critical environmental areas. Mitigating measures should serve multiple purposes, such as drainage control, groundwater recharge, stream protection, air quality, open space preservation, cultural and historic resource protection and landscaping preservation. When technically feasible, standards should be simple and measurable, so they can be implemented without lengthy review processes.

**Discussion:** The Proposed Master Plan is a mixed use, mixed income urban community. It would be designed and constructed to achieve planned density on site while minimizing and/or avoiding environmental impacts to critical areas on- and off-site. For example, the drainage control plan for the proposed project would incorporate elements of the 1998 *King County Surface Water Design Manual* (KCSWDM) and Built Green and Low Impact Development concepts. It would provide enhanced levels of stormwater control to reduce development-related impacts at potentially lower public infrastructure cost, while still meeting the intent of the KCSWDM Core Requirements. Critical areas have generally been avoided; mitigation measures are identified for impacts to critical areas or their buffers. Approximately 20 percent of the site would be devoted to parks, open space, natural areas, and landscaping. The proposed project contains a tree retention plan (discussed below) that would retain as many trees as possible on site, and provide substantially more trees after construction (please refer to the *Water and Plants and Animals* sections of the Draft EIS for additional information).

- B. Residential Land Uses** – *Housing is the major use of urban land in King County, occupying well over half of the County's developed land area. This plan supports the creation of a full range of housing choices for County residents.*

**Policy U-113** – New residential development in the Urban Growth Area should occur where facilities and services can be provided at the lowest public cost and in a timely fashion. The Urban Growth Area should have a variety of housing types and prices, including mobile home parks, multi-family development, townhouses, and small-lot, single-family development.

**Discussion:** Park Lake Homes is an existing multi-family, low income community located within urban unincorporated King County. The Greenbridge redevelopment project would provide a variety of housing types, and improve affordable housing options within the county. It would also create a new mixed-income, mixed-use neighborhood that would be more integrated with surrounding neighborhoods, and provide additional community services/buildings and parks for residents. All necessary facilities and services are readily available. Utilities would be upgraded.

1. **Residential Densities** – *The density of eight homes per acre expressed below is a long-term goal and would be an average density of single-family and multi-family developments. Single-family homes will continue to account for most of the land area used for new development in the County. This plan proposes ways to develop single-family homes more efficiently so that urban land is used more efficiently, homes are affordable, more housing choices are available and densities are adequate to allow for transit services.*

**Policy U-114** – King County shall seek to achieve through future planning efforts over the next twenty years, an average zoning density of at least seven to eight homes per acre in the Urban Growth Area through a mix of densities and housing types. A lower density zone may be used to recognize existing subdivisions with little or no opportunity for infill or redevelopment.

**Policy U-116** – Multi-family housing in the Urban Growth Area should be sited as follows:

- a. In or next to Unincorporated Activity Centers or Community or Neighborhood Business Centers;
- b. In mixed use developments in centers and activity areas; and
- c. On small, scattered parcels integrated into existing urban residential areas. New multi-family housing should be built to the scale and design of the existing community or neighborhood, while contributing to an areawide density that supports transit and allows for a range of housing choices. Over time, zoning should encourage a larger proportion of multi-family housing to be located on small scattered sites rather than on large sites.

**Discussion:** The Comprehensive Plan Land Use Map designates the project site as Urban Residential (>12 du/ac). Redevelopment of the project site would result in an increase in the residential density on the site from approximately 6 dwelling units per gross acre currently to approximately 10-12 dwelling units per gross acre (for 900 and 1,100 units, respectively). Using the applicant's approach to calculating net density pursuant to provisions of the *King County Demonstration Ordinance*, net density would range from 18-22 dwelling units per acre. Please refer to the discussion under the *King County Zoning Code Title 21A.12 – Development Standards – Density and Dimensions* in this section of this DEIS for a discussion of density.

The Proposed Master Plan would increase housing and services near the designated White Center Activity Center, which contains various commercial, retail and service-oriented businesses. The Master Plan includes a variety of

housing types such as town homes, duplexes, apartments, condominiums and housing for senior citizens that would serve a cross section of King County residents. The project site is located along existing transit routes that travel along 8th Avenue SW to and from the activity center and connecting to employment in West Seattle, Downtown Seattle, and the Greater Duwamish Manufacturing and Industrial Center. The Proposed Master Plan is designed to provide population densities and a mix of uses and public services that would promote walking and increased transit use.

2. **Minimum Density** – *In accordance with CCP LU-66(b), King County has included a minimum density requirement in its zoning regulations for all new urban residential development with a zoned density of four or more homes per acre.*

**Policy U-118** – King County should apply minimum density requirements to all urban residential zones of four or more homes per acre, except under limited circumstances such as the:

- a. Presence of significant physical constraints, or
- b. Implementation of standards applied to a property through a property-specific development condition, special district overlay, or subarea plan.

**Discussion:** The King County Housing Authority proposes to achieve minimum density requirements for this site using procedures outlined in *King County's Demonstration Ordinance*. Please refer to the discussion under the *King County Zoning Code Title 21A.12 – Development Standards – Density and Dimensions* and *King County's Demonstration Ordinance* in this Appendix for a discussion of density.

3. **Urban Residential Neighborhood Design and Infill/Redevelopment** – *King County residents can enjoy their urban neighborhoods both for their unique character and for the amenities they provide. Outdoor spaces need to be usable, attractive, comfortable and enjoyable. The design of urban streets, including features such as parking strips, street trees, alleys and off-street parking all contribute to the character of urban neighborhoods. Careful site planning can incorporate neighborhood features, contribute to aesthetic value, minimize site disturbance, conserve energy and, in some cases, reduce development costs. Neighborhood shopping, libraries, larger parks, high schools and public golf courses are examples of uses that provide amenities for nearby residents. Small retail establishments integrated into residential development (e.g., a Laundromat or video rental store) can provide convenient services and help residents reduce automobile trips.*

**Policy U-129** – King County encourages innovative, quality infill development and redevelopment in existing urban areas. A variety of regulatory, incentive and program strategies could be considered, including:

- a. Special development standards for infill sites;
- b. Assembly and resale of sites to providers of affordable housing;
- c. Impact mitigation fee structures that favor infill developments;
- d. Greater regulatory flexibility in allowing standards to be met using innovative techniques; and
- e. Joint public/private loan guarantee pools.

Policy U-130 – Single-family detached homes, townhomes, duplexes and apartments shall be allowed in all urban residential zones, provided that:

- a. Apartments shall not be allowed in the R-1 zone unless fifty percent or more of the site is environmentally constrained; and
- b. Apartments in R-1, R-4, R-6 and R-8 shall not be developed at densities in excess of 18 units per net buildable acre.

Policy U-131 – Urban residential neighborhood design should preserve historic and natural characteristics and neighborhood identity, while providing privacy, community space, and safety and mobility for pedestrians and bicyclists.

Policy U-132 – Site planning tools, such as clustering, shall be permitted in order to allow preservation or utilization of unique natural features within a development.

Policy U-133 – New urban residential developments should provide recreation space, community facilities and neighborhood circulation for pedestrians and bicyclists.

Policy U-134 – Residential developments should provide a variety of housing types and lot patterns through lot clustering, flexible setback requirements and mixed attached and detached housing.

Policy U-135 – Non-residential uses, such as schools, religious facilities, libraries and small-scale retail and personal services, should be integrated into urban residential neighborhoods to create viable neighborhoods with reduced dependence on the automobile. These uses should be sited, designed and scaled to be compatible with existing residential character.

Policy U-136 – Multifamily residential development should provide common and private open space, variation in facades and other building design features which may include varying window treatments, building colors and materials, and light fixtures that will give a residential scale and identity to multifamily development.

Policy U-137 – King County should support infill and redevelopment proposals that serve to improve the overall character of existing communities or neighborhoods.

**Discussion:** The Proposed Master Plan is a mixed use infill project in an urban area. It would increase housing and services near the designated White Center Activity Center, which contains various commercial, retail and service-oriented businesses, and would create a mixed-income community providing affordable housing. The project includes a variety of attached and detached housing types and sizes, including town homes, duplexes, apartments, condominiums and housing for senior citizens. Setbacks would vary in size. The Proposed Master Plan provides approximately 80,000 to 100,000 sq. ft. of community service, recreational and neighborhood retail space integrated with residential uses. The most intensive development would be located in a core area internal to the site. The Proposed Master Plan would also provide approximately 19.3 acres of parks and open space, including a community park, neighborhood parks, pocket parks, linear parks, trails and natural areas. The project site is located along existing transit

routes that travel along 8th Avenue SW to and from the activity center and connecting to employment in West Seattle, Downtown Seattle, and the Greater Duwamish Manufacturing and Industrial Center. It is designed to provide population densities and a mix of uses and public services that would promote walking and increased transit use.

Redevelopment would revitalize a currently deteriorated public housing project and enhance a sense of pride in the community. Changes in visual quality and community character are expected to be positive. No historic sites or buildings are located on the site.

- 4. Residential Site Improvement Standards and Public Services** – *The following policies govern King County land use regulations and functional plans that contain improvement standards for the review of proposed rezones, residential subdivisions, short subdivisions, multi-family buildings and construction permits. Neighborhood recreational space and parks are important amenities for residents. The higher the density, the more essential such amenities become to a desirable living environment. If the site of a proposed development is large enough, a park site dedication or private park can be required as a condition of a rezone, subdivision or site plan approval.*

Policy U-138 – Residential developments within the Urban Growth Area, including mobile home parks, shall provide the following improvements:

- a. Paved streets (and alleys if appropriate), curbs and sidewalks, and internal walkways when appropriate;
- b. Adequate parking that may vary depending on local transit service levels;
- c. Street lighting and street trees;
- d. Storm water control;
- e. Public water supply;
- f. Public sewers; and
- g. Landscaping around the perimeter and parking areas of multifamily developments.

Policy U-139 – Common facilities such as recreation space, internal walkways, roads, parking, solid waste and recycling areas should be provided in multifamily developments.

Policy U-140 – Recreation space based on the size of the developments shall be provided on site, except that in limited cases, fee payments for local level park and outdoor recreation needs may be accepted by King County.

Policy U-141 – Recreation spaces located within a residential development, except those for elderly or other special needs populations, shall include a child's play area.

Policy U-142 – Recreation spaces located in residential developments in the Urban Area should include amenities such as play equipment, open grassy areas, barbecues, benches, trails and picnic tables.



**Discussion:** The Proposed Master Plan has a grid street pattern that would replace the existing curvilinear street configuration associated with Park Lake Homes. (Please see *Table 3* in *Section II* of the Draft EIS for an overview of typical street design characteristics). A new “community neighborhood collector” street classification is proposed. Typical travel lanes would be 12 ft. wide and parking (angled or parallel) would be provided on one or both sides of most streets. Narrower roads are intended to slow traffic and promote pedestrian circulation. Preliminary estimates indicate that the proposed project would provide approximately 2,500 parking spaces including an estimated 1,910 spaces of off-street parking and 590 spaces on-street parking.

The proposal would involve replacement of all existing utilities on-site, including water, sanitary sewer, storm drainage, and electrical/telephone/cable. It would provide approximately 19.3 acres of parks and open space, including a community park, neighborhood parks, pocket parks, linear parks, trails and natural areas; parks are consistent with zoning requirements. In addition, an integrated storm drainage plan would provide drainage and conveyance based on the amount of impervious coverage (roofs, parking areas, walkways) within each block area. The storm drainage plan incorporates “built green” and “low impact development” concepts to enhance stormwater control and reduce development-related impacts (at lower infrastructure cost) while still meeting the intent of the *King County Surface Water Design Manual*.<sup>1</sup>

## **HOUSING**

**A. *Housing Choice and Opportunity throughout King County*** – *Adequate choices and opportunities are essential to fully address the spectrum of housing needs for all King County residents. A basic goal of the GMA is to encourage affordable housing. Likewise, the King County Comprehensive Plan promotes affordable housing for all County residents by supporting adequate funding, zoning, and regional cooperation to create new and diverse housing choices in communities throughout the County.*

**1. *Range of Housing Choices*** – *Interjurisdictional cooperation and public/private partnerships are needed to address the full range of critical housing needs. Meeting these objectives will entail providing sufficient land for a variety of affordable housing such as higher density single-family homes, multi-family properties, manufactured housing, accessory apartments and mixed-use developments.*

**Policy U-401** – King County shall work with cities and the private sector to encourage a wide range of housing within the Urban Growth Area to meet the needs of our diverse population, support economic growth, ensure an equitable and rational distribution of low income and affordable housing throughout the County and provide housing choices for people of all income levels.

---

<sup>1</sup> King County, 1998.

Policy U-402 – Through subarea and regional planning with cities, incentives programs and funding initiatives, King County shall plan for housing to meet the needs of all economic segments of the population throughout the Urban Growth Area and within Rural Towns. King County shall plan for construction or preservation of housing units affordable to households as follows:

- 24% of housing stock should be affordable to households below 50% of the King County median income;
- 17% of housing stock should be affordable to households between 50% and 80% of the King County median income;
- 20% of housing stock should be affordable to households between 80% and 120% of the King County median income; and
- 39% of housing stock should be affordable to households above 120% of the King County median income.

Policy U-407 – King County should encourage land use and investment strategies to stimulate mixed-use and mixed-income developments as a way to integrate neighborhoods and increase housing choices.

Policy U-408 – King County should encourage affordable housing through redevelopment of non-residential buildings, such as schools and commercial buildings, in locations suitable for housing and in ways that preserve significant historic features where appropriate.

**Discussion:** The Proposed Master Plan would construct 900-1,100 housing units for a variety of income and demographic groups. The proposal would be funded through a HOPE VI Redevelopment grant from the Federal Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), a program that funds the revitalization of public housing projects. Federal housing policy allows for households with incomes up to 80 percent of the area median income to apply for public housing. However, in practice, the vast majority of public housing applicants have incomes less than 30 percent of the area median income, or between 31 percent and 50 percent of the median. Of the current 3,869 public housing applicants, 89 percent have incomes of less than 30 percent of median and 9 percent have incomes between 31 percent and 50 percent. The 300 units of public housing to be replaced on site will serve returning residents, and households from the KCHA waiting list that have this same income profile. KCHA may chose to develop fewer workforce housing units and more homeownership opportunities in response to availability of financing and market demand. One possible development scenario would result in 200 units of workforce, 300 public housing units, and 400 homeownership units. Effects of the proposal on affordable housing are addressed in the *Socioeconomics (Housing)* section of the Draft EIS. King County's *Consolidated Housing Plan* is also discussed therein.

- B. Access to Housing** – *An important goal of addressing affordable housing needs is the successful integration of housing for low-income households into the larger community. Publicly funded developments can contribute to increasing access to housing for lower income and special needs residents through new construction or acquisition and rehabilitation of existing housing.*

Policy U-440 – King County should use land use planning and funding programs to help site community facilities and assisted publicly funded housing so that low- and moderate-income residents and the elderly have convenient access to community and transportation services.

**Discussion:** Greenbridge would be a mixed-income community providing new, safe, habitable and affordable housing close to local services and amenities. Numerous community services would be located on site; please refer to Section II of the Draft EIS. The site is located within walking distance of the White Center Activity Center and public transportation routes.

- C. New Housing Models** – *The characteristics of people seeking housing continue to change. Today, there are more single adults living alone or in shared housing than ever before. More families are single-parent households. Many households have two parents working full-time. As the population ages, more seniors will need housing. King County can assist in the development of housing types that meet the needs of these individuals and families by funding affordable housing, revising development standards and/or expediting permit processing. Demonstration projects can provide needed housing for low-income households and test new models for housing simultaneously.*

Policy U-447 – King County should assist in development of innovative, affordable demonstration projects by exploring alternative land development, flexible development standards, and construction techniques.

**Discussion:** Greenbridge is one of three projects that are part of *King County's Demonstration Project Ordinance* (discussed below). The ordinance supports testing new housing models by exploring alternative land development, flexible development standards and construction techniques, home ownership methods, and development projects with shared common areas, open space and community facilities. The purpose of these “low-impact development” and “Built Green” demonstration projects is to determine whether innovative permit processing, site development and building construction techniques result in environmental benefits, affordable housing, and lead to administrative and development cost savings for project applicants and King County. Expected benefits include improved conditions of habitat, ground and surface waters within a watershed, reduced impervious surface areas for new site infrastructure in developed and redeveloped projects, greater use of recycled-content building materials and more efficient use of energy and natural resources, and the opportunity to identify and evaluate potential substantive changes to land use development regulations that support and improve natural functions of watersheds.

Greenbridge would be redeveloped as a mixed-income, mixed-use community incorporating elements of low impact and built green development. Consistent with the objectives of the HOPE VI program, it would include a variety of attached and detached housing types, for rent and for sale, including 300 units affordable to low income residents. Non-residential uses would provide a range of community-oriented services and some everyday retail uses. Narrower streets would help reduce impervious surfaces. A new stormwater management system is proposed, integrating detention and treatment facilities. Some modifications to King County regulations would be necessary to accomplish these objectives.

## **ENVIRONMENTAL ELEMENT**

### **Natural Environment**

- A. Protection and Regulation** – *Protecting and restoring air quality, water resources, soils, and plant, fish, and animal habitats are among King County's primary goals. This chapter establishes policies to protect the environment and enhance the region's high quality of life. Most of this chapter's policies provide a basis for either new non-regulatory approaches or for existing regulations. Some new regulations are necessary to implement the policies. However, new regulations such as wetland mitigation banking, offer flexibility compared with existing regulations.*

Policy E-107 – The protection of lands where development would pose hazards to health, property, important ecological functions or environmental quality shall be achieved through acquisition, enhancement, incentive programs and appropriate regulations. The following natural landscape features are particularly susceptible and should be protected:

- a. Floodways of 100-year floodplains;
- b. Slopes with a grade of 40 percent or more or landslide hazards that cannot be mitigated;
- c. Wetlands and their protective buffers;
- d. Streams and their protective buffers;
- e. Channel migration hazard areas;
- f. Designated wildlife habitat networks;
- g. Critical Aquifer Recharge Areas;
- h. Marine beaches, wetlands, intertidal and subtidal habitat and riparian zones including bluffs;
- i. Regionally Significant Resource Areas and Locally Significant Resource Areas; and
- j. Fish and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Areas, and other critical habitat areas identified for protection through Water Resource Inventory Area plans.

**Discussion:** The Proposed Master Plan has been designed and would be constructed to minimize/avoid environmental impacts to the project site and designated critical areas. Potentially affected sensitive areas, on-site and off-site, include steep slopes and landslide hazards, wetlands, streams, and aquifer recharge areas. Impacts and mitigation measures are included in the following sections of the Draft EIS: *Earth, Water, and Plants and Animals*.

Some modifications to buffer requirements are proposed pursuant to the Demonstration Ordinance.

**B. Water Resources** – *King County's water resources include Puget Sound, rivers, streams, lakes, wetlands, marine nearshore and receiving waters of Puget Sound, and groundwater. In order to preserve and enhance the water resources in King County, those resources must be managed as an integrated system, not as distinct and separate elements. In order to minimize adverse impacts on the water resources of King County and ensure our continued ability to receive the benefits they provide, we need to promote responsible land and water resource planning and use.*

Policy E-126 – Stormwater runoff shall be managed through a variety of methods, with the goal of limiting impacts to aquatic resources, protecting and enhancing the viability of agricultural lands and promoting groundwater recharge. Methods of stormwater management shall include temporary erosion and sediment control, flow control facilities, water quality facilities as required by the Surface Water Design Manual, and Best Management Practices as described in the Stormwater Pollution Control Manual. Runoff caused by development shall be managed to prevent adverse impacts to water resources and farmable lands. Regulations shall be developed for lands outside of the Urban Areas that favor non-structural stormwater control measures when feasible including: vegetation retention and management; seasonal clearing limits; limits on impervious surface; and limits on soil disturbance.

**Discussion:** The Draft EIS considers alternative approaches to stormwater management. The Proposed Master Plan would include installation of a new integrated stormwater system. New onsite stormwater treatment facilities would be constructed, including a combination of “Built Green and Low Impact” design concepts encouraged by the Demonstration Ordinance, such as biofiltration swales, and captured roof drain downspout systems for infiltrations; stormwater detention ponds; new water quality vaults; water quality wetponds and a diversion of a stormwater runoff from a portion of the Lake Garrett basin to the Duwamish River basin. During construction, an erosion and sedimentation control plan (ESCP), which may include a combination of interceptor swales, straw bale barriers, silt fences, and straw mulch for temporary protection of exposed soils and receiving water bodies, the construction of a diversion, temporary stormwater ponds, and adoption of a spill prevention plan to reduce an accident-related water quality impacts. Please refer to the *Project Description and the Water* section of the Draft EIS for additional information.

Policy E-128 – River and stream channels, stream outlets, headwater areas, and riparian corridors should be preserved, protected and enhanced for their hydraulic, hydrologic, ecological and aesthetic functions, including their functions in providing woody debris sources to salmonid-bearing streams.

Policy E-132 – King County's overall goal for the protection of wetlands is no net loss of wetland functions within each drainage basin. Acquisition, enhancement, regulations, and incentive programs shall be used independently or in combination with one another to protect and enhance wetlands functions

Policy E-133 – Development adjacent to wetlands shall be sited such that wetland functions are protected, an adequate buffer around the wetlands is provided, and significant adverse impacts to wetlands are prevented.

Policy E-134 – Areas of native vegetation that connect wetland systems should be protected. Whenever effective, incentive programs such as buffer averaging, density credit transfers, or appropriate non-regulatory mechanisms shall be used.

Policy E-136 – Public access to wetlands for scientific, recreational use, and traditional cultural use is desirable, providing that public access trails are carefully sited, sensitive habitats and species are protected, and hydrologic continuity is maintained.

Policy E-138 – Enhancement or restoration of degraded wetlands may be allowed to maintain or improve wetland functions provided that all wetland functions are evaluated in a wetland management plan, and adequate monitoring, code enforcement and evaluation is provided and assured by responsible parties. Restoration or enhancement must result in a net improvement to the functions of the wetland system. Technical assistance to small property owners should be considered.

Policy E-139 – Alterations to wetlands may be allowed to:

- a. Accomplish a public agency or utility development;
- b. Provide necessary utility, stormwater tightline and road crossings; or
- c. Avoid a denial of all reasonable use of the property, provided all wetland functions are evaluated, the least harmful and reasonable alternatives are pursued, affected significant functions are appropriately mitigated, and mitigation sites are provided with monitoring.

Policy E-146 – The existing flood storage and conveyance functions and ecological values of floodplains, wetlands, and riparian corridors shall be protected, and should, where possible, be enhanced or restored.

**Discussion:** The Proposed Master Plan would be designed and constructed to minimize/avoid environmental impacts to the site and designated critical areas. No adverse direct impacts to sensitive areas would occur. Some modifications to standard buffer requirements are requested pursuant to the Demonstration Ordinance. Impacts are addressed in the *Earth, Water, and Plants and Animal* sections of the Draft EIS.

Policy E-150 – King County should protect ground water recharge quantity by promoting methods that infiltrate runoff where site conditions permit, except where potential ground water contamination cannot be prevented by pollution source controls and stormwater pretreatment.

**Discussion:** The eastern portion of the project site is mapped as an aquifer recharge area highly susceptible to contamination. Proposed water quality treatment would improve the quality of water that infiltrates. The *Water*

section of the Draft EIS concludes that, because of geologic conditions and the location of wells, there is low likelihood of contamination.

Policy E-154 – Grading and construction activities shall implement erosion control Best Management Practices and other development controls as necessary to reduce sediment and pollution discharge from construction sites to minimal levels.

Policy E-155 – Land uses permitted in Erosion Hazard Areas shall minimize soil disturbance and should maximize retention and replacement of native vegetative cover.

Policy E-159 – The use of native plants should be encouraged in landscaping requirements and erosion control projects, and in the restoration of stream banks, lakes, shorelines, and wetlands.

Policy E-161 – Avalanche or Landslide Hazard Areas should not be developed unless the risks and adverse impacts associated with such development can be reduced to a non-significant level. Development proposed in or adjacent to avalanche or landslide hazard areas shall be adequately reviewed and mitigated to ensure development does not increase landslide or erosion hazards that would adversely impact downstream properties or natural resources.

**Discussion:** The Proposed Master Plan would be designed and constructed to minimize/avoid environmental impacts to designated geologic hazard areas. A reduction in the standard 50 foot steepslope/landslide hazard buffers is proposed in two locations pursuant to the Demonstration Ordinance. Please refer to the *Earth* section of the Draft EIS for more information.

Policy E-165 – The County shall strive to maintain the existing diversity of species and habitats in the County. In the Urban Growth Area, King County should strive to maintain a quality environment that includes fish and wildlife habitats that support the greatest diversity of native species consistent with the density objectives. The County should maximize wildlife diversity in the Rural Area.

Policy E-167 – Habitats for species which have been identified as endangered, threatened, or sensitive by the state or federal government shall not be reduced and should be preserved. In the Rural Area and Natural Resource Lands, habitats for candidate species identified by the county, as well as species identified as endangered, threatened, or sensitive by the state or federal government shall not be reduced and should be preserved.

Policy E-171 – Development proposals should be assessed for the presence of species of local importance. A comprehensive assessment should follow a standard procedure or guidelines and shall occur one time during the development review process.

Policy E-177 – New development should, where possible, incorporate native plant communities, both through preservation of existing native plants into the site plan, and addition of new native plants.

**Discussion:** As is discussed in the *Plants and Animals* section of the Draft EIS, there are no federal or state threatened, endangered or sensitive plant or animal species known to exist on the project site.

As part of the Proposed Master Plan, most of the existing native vegetation cover would remain in open space tracts. In addition, “built-green” and low-impact design principles would be implemented to limit effective impervious area and provide biofiltration of stormwater runoff. These measures would help protect remaining native habitats around the perimeter of the site and farther off site from adverse impacts of erosion or sediment deposition, and would help protect water quality of off-site surface waters, such as the Salmon Creek 1 wetland. Retention of existing forested vegetation on the slopes along the eastern and western property boundaries and landscaping with native plant species, where feasible, especially trees and shrubs that provide ground cover for nesting birds, cover for small mammals, and feeding sites (such as where landscaped areas abut native growth areas), would help increase habitat values of otherwise altered landscapes. The Proposed Master Plan also contains a tree retention plan that would retain as many trees as possible on site, while providing substantially more trees after construction. Please refer to the *Plants and Animals* and *Fish Resources* sections of the Draft EIS for more information about potential impacts and mitigation.

### ***King County Demonstration Ordinance (No. 14662)***

**Summary:** *Greenbridge* has been planned and is being reviewed by King County as a demonstration project pursuant to *King County’s Demonstration Ordinance No. 14662* (adopted in May 2003). The objectives of the demonstration ordinance are to: encourage innovative approaches to land development, design and stormwater management; reduce development impacts; improve habitat and water quality; reduce impervious surface; encourage affordable housing; promote use of recycled materials in building materials; conserve energy; and employ eco-friendly building techniques.

To achieve these objectives and benefits, the demonstration ordinance provides opportunities for flexibility regarding land uses, density, dimensional standards, road widths, drainage design, landscaping, parking and circulation, signs and environmentally sensitive areas. If a non-residential use is subject to a conditional use permit in the R-12 through R48 zones and not subject to a conditional use permit in the NM zone, the use may be permitted without requiring a conditional use permit. Modifications and waivers from applicable code requirements may be considered by the applicable County department or hearing examiner in conjunction with review of the project application. Criteria for modifications or waivers (at least two must be met) include: using natural site characteristics to protect natural systems; addressing stormwater safety, function, appearance and environmental protection; contribution to achievement of a two- or three-star rating under the Built Green “Green Communities” program; and reducing



housing costs without decreasing environmental protection. Modifications to sensitive area requirements must demonstrate a net improvement to the functions of the sensitive area.

Greenbridge is one of three projects in the County that will apply “built green” and low impact design principles. The proposed site plan incorporates a number of modifications and variances to County standards, as permitted by the ordinance. Requests for modifications and waivers submitted with the subdivision application include: road standards; drainage design; density and dimensions (measurement of interior building setbacks); environmentally sensitive areas; design; landscaping; parking; and signs. Other modifications and waivers may be identified by King County as a result of the development review process.

***Discussion:*** The Proposed Master Plan intends to request a number of modifications to King County Code per the Demonstration Ordinance, including the calculation of minimum density, reductions in buffer areas for sensitive areas, variations in setbacks, and changes to drainage requirements.

## **King County Zoning Code – Title 21A**

***Summary:*** Consistent with provisions of the Growth Management Act, King County’s Zoning Code is directed toward implementing the goals and policies of the County’s Comprehensive Plan and subarea plans.

### **Chapter 21A.04 – Zones, Maps And Designations**

***21A.04.080 Urban Residential Zone*** – The proposed site is zoned Urban Residential 12-48 du/ac (R-18) under Title 21A.

- A. The purpose of the urban residential zone is to implement comprehensive plan goals and policies for housing quality, diversity and affordability, and to efficiently use urban residential land, public services and energy. These purposes are accomplished by:*
  - 1. Providing, in the R-12 through R48 zones, for a mix of predominantly apartment and townhouse dwelling units, mixed-use and other development types, with a variety of densities and sizes in locations appropriate for urban densities;*
  - 2. Allowing only those accessory and complementary nonresidential uses that are compatible with urban residential communities; and*
  - 3. Establishing density designations to facilitate advanced area-wide planning for public facilities and services, and to protect environmentally sensitive sites from over development.*
- B. Use of this zone is appropriate in urban areas, activity centers, or Rural Towns designated by the Comprehensive Plan as follows:*
  - 1. The R-12 through R-48 zones next to Unincorporated Activity Centers, in Community or Neighborhood Business Centers, in mixed-use development, on small, scattered lots integrated into existing residential areas, or in Rural Towns, that are served at the time of development by adequate public sewers, water supply, roads and other needed public facilities and services.*

***Discussion:*** The King County Zoning Code designates the project site as Urban Residential 12-48 du/ac (R-18). The Proposed Master Plan includes a

variety of housing types, including town homes, duplexes, apartments, condominiums and housing for senior citizens. The Proposed Master Plan would enhance the quality of housing on the site and increase housing and services near the designated *White Center Activity Center*. The Proposed Master Plan residential uses include community services and some retail.

#### **Chapter 21A.08 – Permitted Uses**

21A.08.020 – Interpretation of land use tables – *The use of a property is defined by the activity for which the building or lot is intended, designed, arranged, occupied or maintained. According to the Permitted Land Use Tables, the Urban Residential zone (R12- R-48) includes all forms of residential and residential accessory uses, associated recreational facilities, schools, and limited neighborhood commercial uses.*

**Discussion:** The proposal includes 900 – 1,100 housing units in a variety of housing types. The proposal would also provide approximately 80,000 to 100,000 sq. ft. of community service, recreational and neighborhood retail space, as well as approximately 19.3 acres of parks and open space. The community service and retail uses are more extensive than indicated in 21A.08. The Demonstration Ordinance, however, permits a wide variety of uses typically permitted in the Neighborhood Business Zone.

#### **Chapter 21A.12 – Development Standards – Density and Dimensions**

*The purpose of this chapter is to establish basic dimensional standards for development relative to residential density and as well as specific rules for general applications. The standards and rules are established to provide flexibility in project design, and maintain privacy between adjacent uses.*

21A.12.030 – Densities and dimensions – residential zones – *According to the tables in 21A.12.030, the base density for the project site is 18 du/ac and maximum density allowed is 27 du/ac<sup>2</sup>. Minimum density is 75 percent of the base density, or approximately 13.5 du/ac; the code calculates the minimum based on a required number of housing units. Other development standards for this zone include a minimum lot width of 30 feet; minimum street setback of 10 feet; minimum interior setback of 5 feet; height limit of 60-80 feet; and a maximum impervious surface amount of 85 percent.*

**Discussion:** The applicant proposes to meet minimum density requirements by using provisions contained in *King County's Demonstration Ordinance*. To calculate the proposed density for the project site, the applicant proposes to subtract all non-residential uses (i.e., ROW, community service uses, sensitive areas) from the total site area to come up with the "net buildable area" for the project, which would then be used to calculate the minimum density of the site. According to this formula, using the table below [93.5-

---

<sup>2</sup> This maximum density may be achieved only through the application of residential density incentives in accordance with KCC Chapter 21A.34 - General Provisions - Residential Density Incentives – or transfer of development rights in accordance with KCC Chapter 21A.37 - General Provisions - Transfer of Development Rights (TDR), or any combination of density incentive or density transfer. Maximum density may only be exceeded in accordance with KCC 21A.34.040F.1.g. (Public Benefits and Density Incentives).

43.2=50.3x18x.75=679du], the number of dwelling units proposed (900-1,100) would exceed the minimum density requirement. The rationale for modifying the calculation is intended to reflect that lands devoted to non-residential uses would not be available for residential development, and to reflect the objectives, design approach and financial feasibility of the proposed master plan.

King County Code 21A.06.797 calculates the net buildable area for a project site as the total site area less the following areas:

Areas ...dedicated for public rights-of-way in excess of sixty feet in width; sensitive areas and their buffers; areas required for [above-ground] stormwater control facilities; on-site recreation areas; Regional Utility Corridors; and other areas required by King County to remain undeveloped.

According to this formula, using acreages from the table below [93.5-10.4=50.3x18x.75=1,121du], the minimum density requirement would be 1,121 dwelling units. The maximum number of proposed dwelling units (1,100) would be 21 units (2 percent) less than the minimum using the approach identified in the Code. As noted, Greenbridge proposes to modify this calculation using the provisions of the Demonstration Ordinance.

**Proposed/Developed Site Area Table**

<b>Areas</b>	<b>Acres</b>
<b>Residential Uses:</b>	
Med-High Density/High Density (6-24 du/ac)	47.0
Multi-family (24-50 du/ac)	3.3
<b>Total</b>	<b>50.3</b>
<b>Non-Residential Uses:</b>	
ROW/Access Tracts	22.5
Recreation	6.9
Community Service Tracts	3.8
School Use Tracts	3.4
Sensitive Areas	2.8
Landscape/Other Open Space	2.0
Stormwater Management Tracts	0.7
Utility Tracts	1.1
<b>Total</b>	<b>43.2</b>

*Source: Goldsmith and Assoc, 2003*

Greenbridge also is proposing modifications to setback standards in some locations. The master plan concept is based on locating building closer to the street to reinforce an urban, pedestrian-oriented design.

#### **Chapter 21A.14.180-200 – Recreation Space**

The zoning code includes standards for on-site recreation space which is calculated based on the size of housing units. Apartments and townhouses developed in Urban Residential zones at a density of greater than 8 dwelling units per acre and mixed-use development require the following open space:

- Studio and one bedroom – 90 square feet per unit;
- Two bedroom – 130 square feet per unit; and
- Three or more bedrooms – 170 square feet per unit.

Indoor recreation space may also be credited towards the total recreation space requirement subject to criteria relating to location, design and function. Stormwater tracts may also be credited towards the open space requirement based on design criteria.

Play areas are required within on-site recreation space, except when public parks or facilities are available within ¼ mile. Play apparatus must be at least 400 square feet in size and be located adjacent to a main pedestrian path or near building entrances.

**Discussion:** The Proposed Master Plan provides recreational resources in compliance with KCC21A.14.180. To comply with King County Code (KCC21A.14.180) the Proposed Master Plan must provide “...recreation space for leisure, play, and sport activities...”. The proposed recreational space total is 6.2 acres, which exceed King County requirements. Other activity areas would be provided in the Wiley Community Center, and at the White Center Heights Elementary School. However, the Proposed Master Plan would not be dependent upon those buildings to meet King County recreation space requirements. Preliminary analysis of the 6.2 acres identified above, indicates that approximately 5.8 acres of the 6.2 acre total meets code criteria as described in KCC 21A.14.180. Further analysis of these recreation spaces will occur as part of the preliminary plat review.

In addition to the 6.2 acres of recreation space, approximately 7.0 acres of open space would be provided. Open space would include sensitive areas, landscape and lawn areas, and stormwater facilities. Open space areas associated with the new elementary school (approximately 5.5 acres) would be in addition to this.

Additional requirements in KCC 21A.14.180 describe the calculations for required recreational facilities (play equipment/areas). The required multiplier is one or more recreational facilities for every 25 residential units. Under the Proposed Master Plan, the minimum requirement for 1,100 units is 44 recreational facilities. Recreational facilities at the Wiley Community Center and the new elementary school are assumed to be available to Greenbridge residents and have been used to meet King County’s requirements for recreational facilities. The new school would provide approximately 20 recreational facilities.

## ***Chapter 21A.24 – Environmentally Sensitive Areas***

*The purpose of this chapter is to implement the goals and policies of the Washington State Environmental Policy Act, RCW 43.21C, and the King County Comprehensive Plan, which call for protection of the natural environment and the public health and safety by:*

- A. Establishing development standards to protect defined sensitive areas;*
- B. Protecting members of the public and public resources and facilities from injury, loss of life, property damage or financial loss due to flooding, erosion, avalanche, landslides, seismic and volcanic events, soil subsidence or steep slope failures;*
- C. Protecting unique, fragile and valuable elements of the environment including, but not limited to, wildlife and its habitat;*
- D. Requiring mitigation of unavoidable impacts on environmentally sensitive areas by regulating alterations in or near sensitive areas;*
- E. Preventing cumulative adverse environmental impacts on water availability, water quality, ground water, wetlands, and streams;*
- F. Measuring the quantity and quality of wetland and stream resources and preventing overall net loss of wetland and stream functions;*
- G. Protecting the public trust as to navigable waters and aquatic resources;*
- H. Meeting the requirements of the National Flood Insurance Program and maintaining King County as an eligible community for federal flood insurance benefits;*
- I. Alerting members of the public including, but not limited to, appraisers, owners, potential buyers or lessees to the development limitations of sensitive areas; and*
- J. Providing county officials with sufficient information to protect sensitive areas.*

21A.24.310 Steep Slope Hazard Areas – Development Standards – *A development proposal on a site containing a steep slope hazard area shall meet the following requirements:*

- A. A minimum buffer of fifty feet shall be established from the top, toe and along all sides of any slope forty percent or steeper.....The buffer may be reduced to a minimum of ten feet if, based on a special study, King County determines that the reduction will adequately protect the proposed development and the sensitive area. The buffer may only be reduced to twenty-five feet in the case of erosion hazard areas.....*

**Discussion:** The Proposed Master Plan requests steep slope buffer modifications pursuant to the Demonstration Ordinance. Criteria in the ordinance for modifications to sensitive area requirements includes a net improvement in the function of the sensitive area. Modifications must also meet additional criteria (at least two) relating to: (1) using site characteristics to protect natural systems; (2) addressing stormwater and drainage safety, function, appearance, and environmental protection based on sound engineering judgment; (3) contributing to a two or three star rating in the Built Green Green Community Program; and (4) reduces housing loss for future project residents, without decreasing environmental protection. Please refer to the discussion in the *Earth* section of the Draft EIS.

21A.24.320 Wetlands – Development Standards – *A development proposal on a site containing a wetland shall meet the following requirements:*

- A. The following minimum buffers shall be established from the wetland edge:*
  - 1. A class 1 wetland shall have a 100-foot buffer;*

2. A class 2 wetland shall have a 50-foot buffer;
3. A class 3 wetland shall have a 25-foot buffer;
4. Any wetland restored, relocated, replaced or enhanced because of a wetland alteration shall have the minimum buffer required for the highest wetland class involved; and
5. Any wetland within 25 feet of the toe of a slope 30% or steeper, but less than 40%, shall have:
  - a. the minimum buffer required for the wetland class involved or a 25-foot buffer beyond the top of the slope, whichever is greater, if the horizontal length of the slope including small benches and terraces is within the buffer for that wetland class; or
  - b. a 25-foot buffer beyond the minimum buffer required for the wetland class involved if the horizontal length of the slope including small benches and terraces extends beyond the buffer for that wetland class.

**Discussion:** The proposed project could affect a Class 3 wetland identified adjacent to the steep slope on the south eastern portion of the site. With the possible exception of drainage improvements (either a drainage outfall, or a drainage conveyance pipe), no development is proposed in this area. Drainage alternatives being considered at this time could involve discharge or piping of stormwater in or near the wetland. The wetland buffer would generally overlap the steep slope buffer in this area. However, a reduction in the steep slope buffer is proposed in this location pursuant to provisions in the King County Demonstration Ordinance. No significant adverse indirect impacts are anticipated to off-site wetlands. Please refer to the discussion in the *Plants and Animals* section of this Draft EIS regarding potential indirect impacts. With the implementation of mitigation measures included in this Draft EIS, no significant impacts to wetlands on-site or off-site are anticipated.

**21A.24.360 Streams – Development Standards – A development proposal on a site containing a stream shall meet the following requirements:**

- A. The following minimum buffers shall be established from the ordinary high water mark or from the top of the bank if the ordinary high water mark cannot be identified.
  1. A class 1 stream shall have a 100-foot buffer;
  2. A class 2 stream used by salmonids shall have a 100-foot buffer;
  3. A class 2 stream shall have a 50-foot buffer;
  4. A class 3 stream shall have a 25-foot buffer;
  8. Any stream restored, relocated, replaced or enhanced because of a stream alteration shall have the minimum buffer required for the stream class involved;
  9. Any stream with an ordinary high water mark within 25 feet of the toe of slope 30% or steeper, but less than 40%, shall have:
    - a. the minimum buffer required for the stream class involved or a 25-foot buffer beyond the top of the slope, whichever is greater, if the horizontal length of the slope including small benches and terraces is within the buffer for that stream; or
    - b. a 25-foot buffer beyond the minimum buffer required for the stream class involved if the horizontal length of the slope including small

*benches and terraces extends beyond the buffer for that stream class;  
and*

10. 10. Any stream adjoined by a riparian wetland or other contiguous sensitive area shall have the buffer required for the stream class involved or the buffer that applies to the wetland or other sensitive area, whichever is greater.

**Discussion:** A Class 3 stream has been identified along the eastern border of the site, at the toe of a steep slope area. Drainage alternatives being considered could involve the discharge or piping of stormwater in or near this stream. A reduction in the steep slope buffer is proposed in this location pursuant to provisions in the King County Demonstration Ordinance (please refer to the *Earth* section and the discussion of the *King County Demonstration Ordinance* below in this section of the Draft EIS for additional information). Potential stream impacts are discussed in the Fisheries section of this Draft EIS.

### ***White Center Community Development Investment Plan***

**Summary:** The 2001 White Center Community Development Investment Plan is the result of collaboration between White Center neighborhood leaders, King County (Office of Regional Policy and Planning), and the Annie E. Casey Foundation (AECF). The plan is an outgrowth of recent efforts by the AECF to help strengthen families and the neighborhood of White Center through an initiative called Making Connections. The goal of this initiative is to help a small number of struggling neighborhoods across the country become places where children and their families can flourish. White Center was one of 22 neighborhoods nationwide chosen because the Foundation recognizes that while most families in White Center are struggling to provide the basic needs for their families, it is also a community with tremendous potential for success.

King County received a grant from the Foundation to work with members of the White Center Community to develop a Community Development Investment Plan. The plan contains a coordinated and comprehensive community development strategy for White Center that identifies opportunities for partnership and investment that would make a significant contribution to the Foundation's goal of Neighborhood Transportation and Family Development.

The Plan attempts to provide visionary and practical strategies for implementing a small number of neighborhood revitalization and family-strengthening projects that fall within four broad areas of focus: Economic Development, Housing, Community Center and School.

The projects discussed in the Plan that have been chosen as priorities for the community include:

1. A Community Development Corporation (CDC) – a new neighborhood-based CDC would have the capacity to plan, manage and execute critical economic development and affordable housing projects in the neighborhood that are chosen by the local community.
2. A MainStreet Revitalization Program – Program aimed at providing the community with more quality and diversity of goods and services as well as making the physical infrastructure and appearance of the downtown safer, more accessible, and more attractive to business owners, residents, shoppers and investors.

3. Expansion of the King County jobs Initiative and Creation of a Workforce Development Sounding Board – Expansion of the jobs initiative to include a new counselor to work specifically with this population as well as establishing a Sounding Board to give counselors, employers and community leaders from the immigrant/refugee community a regular forum to meet and exchange ideas.
4. Affordable Housing Repair, Preservation and Development Projects – The plan identifies several short and medium-term strategies to help residents obtain the funding and technical assistance necessary to repair their homes, for preserving existing housing a affordable rents for low-income residents, and for developing a variety of new housing that specifically meet the needs of families.
5. A Neighborhood Housing Advisory/Advocacy Team – This team, made up of Park Lake Homes and surrounding area residents, would serve as a forum for neighborhood residents to gather regularly as the HOPE IV project is implemented, and would bring concerns and ideas to the Housing Authority to ensure that the community's voice is incorporated in this large-scale housing redevelopment project.
6. A Community Cultural Center – A new community center that is specifically focused on cultural arts and that is intended to be a multidisciplinary center that provides a safe, positive central place for all people in the community to gather, play, learn, and celebrate the culture and diversity of the community.
7. A Community School at White Center Heights Elementary – This initiative includes voter registration efforts to support the passage of the school bond needed to rebuild the school and developing a coalition to convert White Center Heights into a Community School allowing the facility to be used by social service agencies and neighborhood residents during off hours.

**Discussion:** The Proposed Master Plan contains elements which address the White Center Plan's key areas of concern. It would contain a range of affordable housing types and improve affordable housing options within the White Center urban area. It would provide employment opportunities through proposed retail and service establishments. Indirectly, Greenbridge would provide population and employment support for revitalization efforts in the White Center Activity Center. The White Center Heights Elementary School, located in the southern portion of the project site, is currently under construction. The Jim Wiley Community Center would be renovated and available for use by residents of Greenbridge and the surrounding community.

## **City of Seattle**

### ***City of Seattle Westwood & Highland Park Neighborhood Plan (1999)***

**Summary:** The Westwood & Highland Park Neighborhood Planning area is comprised of two neighborhoods joined by Delridge Way SW, and is generally bounded by 35<sup>th</sup> Avenue SW on the west, 9<sup>th</sup> Avenue SW on the east, SW Holden Street on the north, and SW Roxbury Street on the south. The Westwood & Highland Park Neighborhood Plan was adopted in April 1999 (Ordinance 119615) in response to the City of Seattle's Comprehensive Plan (1994), which encouraged neighborhoods to become more involved in City decision-making by creating their own plans that would be integrated into City's overall plan. The plan consists of four sections: 1) Introduction to & Summary of the Westwood & Highland Park Neighborhood, 2) Parks,



Recreation & Open Space, 3) Transportation, and 4) Land Use, Housing & Community Development.

Key Strategies for this neighborhood plan include linking Westwood and Highland Park together through the Longfellow Creek Legacy Trail Network; integrating the Denny Sealth Southwest Recreation Complex Campus Master Plan; revitalizing the “Triangle” Commercial Core Area (16<sup>th</sup> Avenue SW District); and the Delridge Way SW Improvement Project.

The following goals and policies from the Neighborhood Plan are most applicable to redevelopment of Park Lake Homes.

***Housing Goal:*** A community with both single-family and multi-family residential areas and the amenities to support diverse population.

***Housing Policies:***

- Encourage new housing development that serves a range of income levels.
- Promote the attractiveness of higher density residential areas through the enhancement of basic infrastructure and amenities.
- Seek to ensure safe and well-maintained housing.
- Support the Seattle Housing Authority and non-profits in the development of high quality housing that serves the low-income.

***Discussion:*** The Park Lake Homes Community is an existing multi-family community located within urban unincorporated King County, adjacent to the southern boundary of the Westwood & Highland Park Neighborhood Planning area. The Proposed Master Plan would create a mixed-income community that provides new, safe, habitable and affordable housing close to local services and amenities. Greenbridge would be funded through a HOPE VI Redevelopment grant from the Federal Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). Redevelopment of the project site would enhance the existing character, provide a variety of housing types, and improve affordable housing options within the county. The Proposed Master Plan would also create a new neighborhood that would be more integrated with surrounding neighborhoods, and provide additional community services and parks for residents.

## ***City of Seattle Environmentally Critical Areas Ordinance – Chapter 25.09***

***Summary:*** This chapter of the Seattle Municipal Code implements the Seattle Environmentally Critical Areas Policies, as adopted by Resolution 28559, and as amended. This chapter applies to all development located in designated environmentally critical areas.

The following are defined as environmentally critical areas

1. Geologic Hazard Areas
  - a. Landslide-prone Areas
    - i. Known Landslide-prone Areas
    - ii. Potential Landslide-prone Areas

1. Areas over 15 percent slope with either impermeable soils, have identified unstable soils, or areas containing springs or groundwater seepage.
2. Steep slope areas of 40 percent average slope or greater
3. Areas covered under 1) or 2) that have been modified (retaining walls, non-engineered cut/fill)
4. Any slope area potentially unstable as a result of rapid stream incision or stream bank erosion.
- b. Liquefaction-prone Areas – areas underlain by cohesion-less soils of low density usually in association with a shallow groundwater table that loses substantial strength during an earthquake.
2. Flood-prone Areas – areas that would likely be covered with or carry water as a result of a 100-year storm....
3. Riparian Corridors – areas within 100-feet measured horizontally from the top of bank...
4. Wetlands
5. Fish and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Areas
6. Abandoned Land Fills

The only environmentally critical areas present near the project site that are within the boundaries of the City of Seattle are steep slopes along the eastern boundary of the site. SMC 25.09.180 contains development standards for sites with steep slopes, among which are the following:

1. Development shall be avoided on areas over forty percent (40%) slope whenever possible.
2. The Director of DCLU shall require a fifteen foot (15 foot) buffer from the top or toe of slope whenever practicable...The width of the buffer may be increased or decreased as determined by the Director...

**Discussion:** The Greenbridge site is located within unincorporated King County, adjacent to the City of Seattle corporate boundary and would minimize or avoid impacts to City-designated Environmentally Sensitive/Critical Areas. Most of the existing native vegetation cover in the steep slope area adjacent to the City's corporate boundary would be retained in open space tracts. A modification to King County's steep slope buffers in this area is proposed. No other critical areas under the jurisdiction of the City of Seattle are located on the site.

## **Federal Plans, Policies & Regulations**

### ***Endangered Species Act***

**Summary:** The Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 USC 1531) requires federal agencies to ensure that any action authorized, funded or carried out is not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of any species listed as endangered or threatened, or result in direct mortality or destruction or adverse modification of critical habitat of listed species. Applicants must consult with the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) and/or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), who review the proposal for potential effects.

**Discussion:** No endangered or threatened species of plants or animals occur on the Greenbridge site. No significant adverse direct or indirect impacts to endangered fish species have been identified; proposed stormwater management facilities could positively effect off-site water bodies. Please refer to the *Plants and Animals* section for further information.

The King County Housing Authority has begun preparation of a biological assessment (BA) to document analyses and compliance with applicable laws. The BA will be prepared and reviewed concurrent with the EIS. Consultation with responsible agencies will also be initiated.

## ***Clean Water Act***

**Summary:** The Clean Water Act (33 USC 1251) is intended to protect the biological, physical and chemical integrity of the nation's waters, including wetlands. The act, which is administered by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (COE) and the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), regulates activities that could affect wetland resources. Section 404 regulates dredging or placement of fill into the "waters of the U.S.", which includes wetlands. A permit program – either a nationwide permit, or an individual permit, depending on size -- is required for projects that affect jurisdictional wetlands.

**Discussion:** One wetland has been preliminarily identified adjacent to the steep slopes on the southeastern portion of the site. This wetland could potentially be impacted directly or indirectly, depending on the type and location of a drainage pipe. Please refer to the *Plants and Animals* section of the Draft EIS for discussion of impacts and potential mitigation.

## ***National Historic Preservation Act***

**Summary:** The National Historic Preservation Act, Section 106 (16 USC 470(f)) requires protection of sites, buildings and objects with national, state or local historic significance. These include properties listed on or eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places.

As defined in the National Advisory Council on Historic Preservation regulations, "criteria of adverse effect" include destruction or alteration of the property; isolation from or alteration of the property's surrounding environment; introduction of visual, audible or atmospheric elements that are out of character with the property or alter its setting; neglect of a property resulting in deterioration or destruction; or transfer or sale without adequate restriction regarding preservation, maintenance or use. Analysis of potential effects (direct and indirect) requires identification of boundaries of the area of potential affect (APE) in consultation with the State Historic preservation Officer (SHPO). Affected tribes were also consulted regarding location of any known cultural resources.

**Discussion:** An APE for the Greenbridge site and surrounding area was identified in consultation with the SHPO. No sites of historic character were identified on national, state or local historic registers. A reconnaissance and analysis of the site's historical use did not identify any cultural or archaeological

resources or indicate that such were likely to be present. Please refer to the Historic and Cultural Resources discussion in the Draft EIS.

### ***HUD Noise Assessment Guidelines***

**Summary:** The U.S. Department of Housing & Urban Development (HUD) has promulgated guidelines for noise abatement and control (24 CFR 51, Subpart B). HUD's general policy is to provide minimum national standards for their programs to protect against excessive noise. These standards, and ameliorative actions as necessary, are to be considered by responsible entities as part of the environmental review process.

HUD's has developed criteria for "site suitability" for its programs. These criteria consider an exterior noise level of 65 dB or less as "suitable," 65 to 75 dB as "normally unacceptable," and exterior noise levels of more than 75 dB as "unacceptable" for HUD assistance. The criteria include the entire noise environment affecting the site and is not limited to noise generated by activities on the site itself. For major rehabilitation projects in the "normally unacceptable" noise range, HUD requires environmental review, special environmental clearance and attenuation. Attenuation of 10 dB is required if noise levels are between 70 and 75 dB.

**Discussion:** Initial noise analysis indicated that traffic-generated noise levels along Roxbury, adjacent to the northwestern portion of the site, are within the "normally unacceptable" range. This measurement does not, however, reflect the Proposed Master Plan design elements, such as building location and orientation, or topography. The Draft EIS analysis discusses a number of mitigation measures that could be used to reduce noise levels. Prior to publication of the Draft EIS, the applicant will conduct additional noise modeling to more precisely determine future exterior noise levels with the proposed master plan and to identify appropriate mitigation.